



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,623	03/01/2004	Roger P. Juneau	P035055US (98029.4P11)	8830
22920	7590	05/30/2007	EXAMINER	
GARVEY SMITH NEHRBASS & NORTH, LLC LAKEWAY 3, SUITE 3290 3838 NORTH CAUSEWAY BLVD. METAIRIE, LA 70002			BRINEY III, WALTER F	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2615		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/790,623	JUNEAU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Walter F. Briney III	2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juneau et al. (US Patent 6,254,526) in view of Kobayashi (US Patent 4,385,977) Steinemann (US Patent 4,945,342) and Tyers et al. (US Patent 4,144,889).

Claims 1-36 are rejected for the reasons presented in the Non-Final Office Action filed 14 November 2006. Therefore, Juneau in view of Kobayashi in view of Steinemann and further in view of Tyers makes obvious all limitations of the claim.

Response to Amendment

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 14 March 2007 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-36 based upon 35 USC 103(a) as set forth in the last Office action.

As a secondary consideration of non-obviousness, the applicant asserts that their experience and efforts exerted in inventing the claimed hearing aid using stainless steel wire evidences the extreme difficulty of the invention and, ergo, non-obviousness. In other words, because the applicants are of, at least, ordinary skill in the art and they personally felt like their efforts required skill beyond the norm, their traversal of the gap

between the prior art Juneau reference and the claimed invention was non-obvious.

This allegation could be argued on objective grounds of the level of one of ordinary skill in the art; however, this is unnecessary.

Specifically, the allegation fails to properly consider the explicit suggestion made by Kobayashi to use stainless steel wire in place of copper wire. While the applicants searched for a solution to their wire breakage issues, the prior art had already presented a solution. In one sense, the applicants' traversal on the grounds that their invention presented them with great difficulty evidences the expenditure of skill, perhaps in excess of that possessed by one of ordinary skill in the art; however, the prior art presented an alternative and more obvious course to the same end. Lacking any reason why the middle ground presented in the prior art should be excluded from consideration in rendering the claimed invention, the question of the level of difficulty is moot since a clear link exists between the prior art teachings.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 14 March 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As stated above, applicants' alternative explanation of how they reduced the claimed invention does not refute the clearly taught manner in which one of ordinary skill in the art could have invented, as set forth in the Non-Final Rejection filed 14 November 2006. Therefore, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter F. Briney III whose telephone number is 571-272-7513. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

wfb
5/24/07